



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

lar instances, I will not controvert, but surely it has been already shown, both from the nature of the compact itself, and the character of the persons who usually engage in it, that the far more frequent effect, is similar to that which would be produced, should a shepherd intrust his charge to the care of a wolf:—from other animals of prey the flock might be protected; but would there be no danger of its falling a sacrifice to the hunger and ferocity of its guardian?

But again, the objection is founded upon the supposition of what is by no means a necessary consequence, that a girl going to service, is afterwards intirely her own mistress. That she is no longer under lock and key is very certain; but are there no other means of retaining influence besides those of the most rigorous coercion? When the simple minded girl, brought up in a cottage, by worthy and affectionate parents, quits their humble roof, at the unexperienced age of fifteen or sixteen, for a service in the neighbouring market-town, is not the consciousness that their eye is upon her, a more powerful protection to her unguarded youth, than all the restraints that the most watchful suspicion could devise?—Shall she lose her character?—Shall she break her mother's heart?—What are her resolutions when these affecting questions present themselves? Have they no efficacy to fortify her mind

against seduction? No energy to keep her feet in the paths of virtue? But the case, it will be said, is not in point; many of these unhappy girls are orphans; they have no pious parents to watch over them, no affectionate relatives to mourn their fall.

That they are orphans, is indeed, their unhappy lot; but, were all our female charity-schools regulated and superintended by neighbouring ladies, who knew them individually, and appeared interested in their happiness, although they had no parents, would they not feel that they had friends? Would they not consider themselves as having a character to lose? And why should the connection be dissolved on their leaving the school? Why might not their former patronesses still continue such? That such a plan is practicable, I know by experience; and that it may be made productive of the most beneficial effects, I dare venture to affirm. That among a great number, all should turn out well, cannot possibly be expected; alas! this does not always happen, even in the best regulated private families; but I think it may be admitted, that if those who are well disposed have the means afforded them of becoming useful and virtuous characters, all is done that can be done for their preservation, and that the blessing of heaven may humbly be hoped for, on the benevolent effort.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF DISTINGUISHED PERSONS.

SKETCH OF THE LIFE OF LADY RACHEL RUSSEL.

"A high-souled helpmate at the patriot's side."

RACHEL, daughter of Thomas Wriothesley, Earl of Southamp-

ton, was born in 1636. Her mother, first wife to the Earl, was the daughter of Henry de Massey, Baron of Rovigny. The Earl of Southampton, distinguished for his talents and independent spirit, was an enemy

to the arbitrary measures pursued by the crown, during the administration of the Earl of Strafford. In the subsequent prosecution of that nobleman, he opposed himself with equal firmness to the parliament, which had, he believed, exceeded the limits of justice, and the constitution. He became eminently serviceable to the King on this occasion, whose cause he adopted against the popular proceedings. He is styled by Burnet, "A fast friend to the public, the wise and virtuous Earl of Southampton, who deserved from the King every thing which he could bestow." At the Restoration he was made Lord High Treasurer, an office which he filled with ability and integrity. He died May 16th, 1667, leaving by his first wife two daughters; Elizabeth, married to Edward Noel, Baron Wriothsley, of Titchfield, &c. &c., and Rachel, wife to Francis Lord Vaughan, eldest son of the Earl of Rocraw, Earl of Carberry. After the death of Lord Vaughan, his widow, in 1669, espoused William Lord Russel, son of William, Earl of Bedford: one son and two daughters were the fruit of this union.

In the struggle against the encroachments of the crown, under Charles II., during a fit of sickness which seized the King at Windsor, the Duke of Monmouth, Lord Russel, and Lord Grey, instigated by the Earl of Shaftesbury, agreed, should the disorder of Charles prove mortal, to oppose in arms the succession of the Duke of York. The King recovered; but their projects were not laid aside. The imprisonment of Shaftesbury gave a check to these machinations, which new encroachments on the liberties of the people had revived. The train was laid, and ready to take fire, when Monmouth was induced by Lord Russel to delay the enterprise. They

often met and consulted on the best means of delivering their country from the dreadful servitude into which it had fallen; and thus far their conduct appears clearly to have been laudable. If they did any thing which could be fairly construed into an actual conspiracy to levy war against the King, they acted, considering the disposition of the nation at that period, very indiscreetly.

At length they were, by their common views and common apprehensions, induced to form a regular plan of insurrection. A council of six was formed, consisting of Monmouth, Russel, Essex, Howard, Algernon Sidney, and John Hambden, grandson to the celebrated patriotic Hambden. These men, though united in a common cause, were instigated by motives widely different. Sidney desired a commonwealth; Essex was animated by the same principle; Monmouth aspired to the crown; while Russel and Hambden, attached to the ancient constitution, proposed only the redress of grievances, and the exclusion of the Duke from the succession. Howard, an unprincipled man, had his own interest only in contemplation.

An inferior order of malcontents were also in the habit of meeting, who indulged themselves, wholly unknown to the council of six, in planning criminal and desperate measures. In this cabal the assassination of the King and of the Duke was freely discussed, and even a project proposed for the purpose. But the plan, however plausible, was loose and wild; neither were there persons, arms, nor horses, provided for its execution. Among those who composed this faction, Keiling, a man who for some bold measures had rendered himself obnoxious to a prosecution, determined to purchase

his safety by revealing the conspiracy. The council of six, though guiltless of the assassination plot, became involved in this discovery. Monmouth absconded; Russel was sent to the Tower; Howard saved himself by basely impeaching his colleagues; while Essex, Sidney, and Hambden, were apprehended upon his evidence. The English laws of treason, under the act of Edward III., were mild and equitable: they required proof of having compassed or intended the King's death, or of having actually levied war against him; greater latitude had been afterwards introduced, both in the proof and definition of the crime. Soon after the restoration of Charles a law had passed, by which the consulting, or intending a rebellion was declared treason; but which required that the prosecution should take place within six months after the commission of the crime. Under this statute the offence of Russel fell. The facts, however, sworn against him, were beyond the limit of the time required by law: to make, therefore, the indictment more extensive, the intention of murdering the King was comprehended in it, by a refinement in law.

Russel, perceiving this irregularity, desired to have the point argued by counsel; but this privilege was refused to him, excepting on condition of his previously confessing the facts laid to his charge. The confounding the two species of treason, a practice supported by precedents, was not the only hardship of which Russel had to complain. Too candid to deny his share in the conspiracy for an insurrection, he contented himself with protesting, truly, that he had never formed any design against the life of the King. A defence so feeble availed him little: his jury, zealous royalists, though

men of fair character, after a short deliberation, brought him in guilty.

The day previous to his trial, he had asked leave of the court that notes of the evidence might be taken for his use. By the attorney general he was informed in reply, that he might, if he pleased, use one of his servants for the purpose. "I ask no assistance," answered the prisoner, "but that of the lady who sits by me." At these words the spectators, turning their eyes on the daughter of the virtuous Southampton, who rose to assist her husband in his distress, melted into tears.

The old Earl of Bedford, the father of Lord Russel, offered to the Duchess of Portsmouth a hundred thousand pounds to procure her interest with the King for the pardon of his son. But every application proved vain. The independent spirit, the patriotism, the popularity, the courage, the talents, and the virtues, of the prisoner, were his most dangerous offences, and became so many arguments against his escape. Charles could be prevailed on only to remit the more ignominious part of the sentence which the law requires to be pronounced against traitors.

Lady Russel threw herself at the feet of the King, and pleaded with tears the merits and loyalty of her father, as an atonement for those offences into which her husband had been drawn, by honest principles.

Charles beheld, unmoved, the daughter of his best friend weeping at his feet: he even rejected her petition for a respite of a few weeks. "Shall I grant that man," said he, "six weeks, who, had it been in his power, would not have granted me six hours?" These tears and these supplications were the last instance of feminine sorrow which Lady Russel betrayed on so

trying an occasion. On finding every effort fruitless for saving the life of her husband, she collected her courage, and fortified her mind for the fatal stroke, confirming by her example the resolution of her Lord.

No one doubted the innocence of Russel respecting the charge of conspiring against the life of the King, which he solemnly denied with his dying breath. The witnesses who deposed against him made no mention of any such design: his principal guilt had been his opposition in parliament to what he deemed unconstitutional measures, with his efforts for the exclusion of the Duke of York from the throne. His friends essayed every means that money and interest could afford to preserve his invaluable life. They engaged that he should promise on his liberation to exile himself from his native land. Lord Cavendish offered to facilitate his escape by changing habits with him, and remaining as his substitute. But Russel refused to save his life by an expedient that might subject his friend to hazard. The Duke of Monmouth sent to him a message, that, if he thought it would avail any thing towards his safety, he would deliver up himself, and share the fate of his friend. To this proposition Russel only replied, "that it would be of no advantage to him to have his friends die with him!" It was proposed by Cavendish that a party of horse should attack the guards, and deliver him forcibly, on his way to the scaffold; an attempt which there was great reason to suppose the people would facilitate. But Lord Russel, firmly opposing any measures which might expose his friends to danger, patiently submitted to his fate.

In the journal of the Duke of Monmouth, he affirms, that the King had told him he was inclined

to save the life of Russel, but found it impossible without breaking with the Duke of York, who, in the meanness of his vengeance, was desirous that the illustrious victim should suffer in the square before York-house! and insult to which the King would not be persuaded to submit.

An order being signed for his execution, a respite of only two days was refused to his friends. Bishops Burnet and Tillotson, with a view of serving him, tried to prevail on him to confess resistance to be unlawful. "He could not tell a lie," was the magnanimous reply of Russel. Tillotson observed, that he did not think resistance authorised by remote fears and consequences, or illegal practices. On this hypothesis, Russel declared he saw no difference between a lawful and a Turkish government; and that, in case of a total subversion, resistance would be too late. In answer to some clergyman, who flattered him with the hope of life on condition of his acknowledging, that subjects had in no case a right to resist the throne, "I can," said he, "have no conception of a limited monarchy, which has not a right to defend its own limitations; neither will my conscience permit me to say otherwise to the King." This firmness in refusing to purchase life by the sacrifice of his principles, affords the best testimony to his integrity and virtue.

As his fate drew near, he expressed his satisfaction that he had chosen death rather than flight, since he felt that, separated from his family and friends, whose affection and society constituted all his happiness, life would have been to him insupportable. To another project suggested by the gallant Cavendish, he replied smiling, that he thanked him very kindly, but would not escape; adding, he could never yet limit his

bounty to his condition; and that the only pleasure he had felt in the anticipation of a large estate, to which he was heir by descent, was in the hope of an extension in the means of doing good. He thanked God, who knew the sincerity of his heart, that he had in all things acted in conformity to the dictates of his conscience; that he could never enter into what he thought wrong, nor could on any occasion tell an untruth.

Tillotson informed the King that Russel had declared to him, that he had associated with those unhappy men, only to preserve the Duke of Monmouth from being ensnared by them into any rash undertaking. Being then questioned why he had not in that case discovered their designs to the King; he answered, he could not betray his friends, nor turn informer while he saw no danger; yet, had things come to a crisis, he would have contrived a method of giving the King warning; and had violence been attempted, would have been the first to oppose it with his sword.

On the Tuesday before his execution, after dinner, when Lady Russel had left him, he spoke with pleasure of the magnanimity she displayed; and observed, "that a separation from her was the severest part of what he had to undergo, since he dreaded lest she should sink under her grief." "At present," he added, "she was in some degree supported by her exertions to save him, by which her mind was occupied: but when her hopes were over, he feared the quickness of her spirits, and the poignancy of her feelings." On Thursday, while she was labouring to gain a respite till Monday, he expressed a wish that she would abandon a cause so hopeless: yet the consideration, that her sorrow might be mitigated by

the recollection that she had spared no possible means for his safety, prevented him from opposing her designs.

His courage never appeared to falter but when he spoke of his wife; his eyes would, on such occasions, fill with tears, while he appeared eager to fly from the subject. On Friday night, as she left him, he embraced her repeatedly, while she restrained her grief lest it should too sensibly affect him. The evening before his death, his children were brought to him; he parted with them and his friends with courage and constancy. Some of his expressions denoted not only composure but pleasantry. Being seized with a bleeding at his nose, "I shall not now," said he to Dr. Burnet, who attended him, "let blood to divert this distemper, that will be done to-morrow." A short time before he was conducted by the sheriffs to the scaffold, he wound up his watch, observing, "he had now done with time, and henceforth must think only on eternity."

When parting from Lady Russel, who commanded herself with heroic fortitude, they mutually preserved a solemn and affecting silence. He declared when she had left him, "that the bitterness of death was past." He praised her character and conduct, while he spoke of his affection for her with eloquence and fervor. He protested that she had ever been to him a blessing; and observed how wretched it would have made him, had she not joined to tenderness and sensibility a spirit too magnanimous to desire him to be guilty of baseness, even for the preservation of his life. He expressed his gratitude to Providence, that had given him a wife, who, to birth, fortune, talents, and virtue, united sensibility of heart, and whose conduct, in the extreme crisis of his

fate, had even surpassed all her other virtues. He spoke of the joy which he felt, that his family would lose nothing by his death, since he left his children in the hands of so admirable a mother, who for their sakes had promised to preserve herself.

The scaffold for his execution was erected in Lincoln's-inn-fields, that the triumph of the court might be manifest, in the exhibition of the illustrious sufferer to the populace. As he passed through the city, Bishops Burnet and Tillotson accompanied him in the coach. The people, who fancied they beheld virtue and freedom suffer with him, melted into tears at the spectacle. As, on passing it, he looked towards Southampton house, a tear started to his eye, which he instantly wiped away. He observed, "that a cloud was hanging over the nation, to which his death would prove more serviceable than his life." The moment before his execution, he affirmed, on the faith of a dying man, that he knew of no plot against the King's person or government; but having submitted himself to the decision of the laws, he was determined to abide the penalty.

The populace beheld with unfeigned grief the fate of their beloved leader, once the object of all their confidence: as he had been the most popular among his own party, so he was the least obnoxious to the opposite faction: every heart sensible to generosity or humanity united in tender commiseration on this affecting catastrophe. Without the least change of countenance, he laid his head on the block: at two strokes it was separated by the executioner from the body. This tragedy took place July 21, 1683. A paper, expressive of his innocence, was delivered by him to the sheriff, which gave great offence at court.

BELFAST MAG. NO. L.

Burnet was questioned on the subject, but the widow of Lord Russel, in a letter to the King, justified and exculpated her husband. Of Lord Russel, it was said by Calamy, "that an age would not repair to the nation his loss; and that his name ought never to be mentioned by Englishmen without respect."

"Thus fell Russel! whose name, and that of Algernon Sidney," says Charles James Fox, in the introductory chapter to his historical fragment, "will, it is hoped, be forever dear to every English heart. When their memories shall cease to be objects of respect and veneration, it requires no spirit of prophecy to foretell that English liberty will be fast approaching to its final consummation. Their deportment was such as might be expected from men who knew themselves to be suffering, not for their crimes, but for their virtues. In courage they were equal: but the fortitude of Russel, who was connected with the world by private and domestic ties, which Sidney had not, was put to the severer trial; the history of the last days of this excellent man's life, fills the mind with such a mixture of tenderness and admiration, that I know not of any scene in history that more powerfully excites our sympathy, or goes more directly to the heart."

Lady Russel sustained the loss of this worthy and beloved husband with the same heroism which she had displayed during his trial and imprisonment. When, in open court, attending by his side, observing and taking notes of all that passed in his favour; when, a weeping suppliant at the feet of the King, she pleaded for a life so precious to her, in the name, and for the services, of a deceased father; when, in meek and solemn silence, without suffering a tear to escape her, she parted for

E 4

ever with a husband so deservedly beloved; she appears equally an object of sympathy, admiration, and reverence.

After this melancholy and cruel event, the widow of the respectable and patriotic Russel proved the faithful guardian of his honour and fame; the wise and active mother to his children; and the friend and patroness of his friends. She survived more than forty years, and died September 29th, 1723, at the advanced age of eighty-seven.

The letters of Lady Russel, written after the decease of her husband, afford an affecting picture of the conjugal affection and fidelity of the writer, whom new trials yet awaited. Wriothesley, Duke of Bedford, her only son, died of the small-pox, May, 1711, in the thirty-first year of his age. To this affliction succeeded the death of her daughter, the Duchess of Rutland, who died in childbed. Lady Russel gave on this occasion a new instance of her fortitude and self command. Her daughter, the Duchess of Devonshire, was also in childbed at the time of her sister's decease. The mother, after beholding one daughter in her coffin, repaired to the chamber of the other, with a composed and tranquil countenance. The Duchess of Devonshire earnestly inquiring after the welfare of her sister, Lady Russel evasively replied, without betraying any emotion, "I have seen your sister out of bed to-day."

To this instance of her fortitude an anecdote may be added, in testimony of her courage and presence of mind, displayed on a lesser and unpremeditated occasion.

"The following relation," says Mr. Selwood,* "I had from Lady

Russel, in Southampton-row, Bedford-house, where the accident happened. Her Ladyship's own words, to the best of my remembrance, were these: 'As I was reading in my closet, the door being bolted, on a sudden the candle and candlestick jumped off the table, an hissing fire ran on the floor, and, after a short time, left some paper in a flame, which with my foot I put into the chimney, to prevent mischief. I then sat down in the dark to consider whence this event should come. I knew my doors and windows were fast, and that there was no way open into the closet but by the chimney; but that something should come down there, and strike my candle off the table in that strange manner, I believed impossible. After I had wearied myself with thinking to no purpose, I rang my bell. The servant in waiting, when I told him what had happened, begged pardon for having, by mistake, given me a mould candle, with a gun-powder squib in it, which was intended to make sport among his fellow-servants on a rejoicing day.' Her Ladyship bid him not be troubled about the matter, for she had no other concern about it than that of not finding out the cause."

It is observable in the letters of Lady Russel, that no expression of resentment, or traces of a vindictive spirit, mingle at any time with the sentiment of grief, by which they are uniformly pervaded, for the fate of her husband. When James II. who had been principally aiding to that fate, became a wanderer in a foreign land, driven from his throne and country, there appears no triumph in the expressions of this Lady, nor even an intimation, that retributive justice had overtaken him. She also

* Mr. Thomas Selwood lived in the family of Lady Russel, copied her letters from the originals, which having published

with permission, he dedicated to the Duke of Bedford.

passes over in silence the tragical end of the barbarous and infamous Jefferies, who had distinguished himself against Lord Russel on his trial.

It appears from several of her letters, that Lady Russel experienced uneasiness, some years after the death of her husband, from dimness and weakness in her sight. From this complaint she was relieved by an operation, in June 1694. Archbishop Tillotson, writing to Dr. Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, on the 28th of June, informs him, "that the eyes of Lady Russel had been

couched, the preceding morning, with good success." From this time till her death, she enjoyed her sight without impediment, and was accustomed, at a very advanced period of life, to write without spectacles. The apprehension of the loss of sight, that invaluable blessing, was sustained by Lady Russel with her wonted courage and resolution. The first persons of the age, both in rank and literature, did honour to themselves by their respect and friendship towards this, amiable, illustrious, and heroic woman.

DETACHED ANECDOTES.

CIVIL RIGHTS NOT DEPENDENT ON RELIGIOUS OPINIONS.

EXTRACT from an act for establishing religious freedom, passed in the Assembly of Virginia:—

"That our civil rights have no dependence on our religious opinions, more than our opinions in physic or geometry; that, therefore, the proscribing any citizen as unworthy of public confidence, by laying upon him an incapacity of being called to offices of trust and emolument, unless he possess or renounce this or that religious opinion, is depriving him injuriously of those privileges and advantages to which, in common with his fellow citizens, he has a natural right."

THE HONOUR OF NEGLECT IN BAD TIMES.

It was a prudent and elegant reply of the virtuous Cato, to an observation of his friend, who seemed surprised, that amidst the numerous statutes with which Rome abounded, there was none erected to that firm and intrepid patriot:—

"I would rather," says he, "that

people should be inquiring, why there was none erected, than why any."

M.

SYMPATHETIC POWDER.

To the effects of the Sympathetic powder, blazoned by Sir Kenelm Digby, unquestionably among the first philosophers of his time, Surgeons are indebted for one of the chief improvements of their art, healing wounds, by what is technically called the first intention. The powder was applied to the weapon by which the wound had been inflicted, covered with salve, and regularly dressed two or three times a day. The wound, meantime, was directed to be brought together, and carefully bound up with clean linen rags, and let alone for seven days. At the end of that period, the bandages were removed, and, to the glory of Sir Kenelm, and the astonishment of the Surgeons and bystanders, the wound was, in a great majority of instances, found perfectly united; and the cure was, with due solemnity, attributed to